



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

## CONSOLIDATED PLAN ADVISORY BOARD MEETING NOTES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2011

CIVIC CENTER PLAZA  
1200 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 1400  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT	BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT
Will Moore, Council District 1 Jennifer Litwak, Council District 2 Vicki Granowitz, Council District 3 Audie de Castro, Council District 4, Chair Robert McNamara, Council District 6 Mathew Kostrinsky, Council District 7	Aaron Freeburg, Council District 8

CITY STAFF
Vivian Moreno, Council Representative, CD8 Beth Murray, Deputy Director, Economic Development Division Liza Fune, CDBG Coordinator Eriberto J. Valdez, Jr., CDBG Program Specialist Norma Medina, CDBG Program Manager Rosalia Hernandez, CDBG Administrative Aide II Maurcell Gresham, San Diego Housing Commission Bill Luksic, San Diego Housing Commission John Nash, San Diego Housing Commission

### **Call to Order/Introductions**

- The Consolidated Plan Advisory Board (CPAB) meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. A quorum was established.

### **Public Comment**

- The Board heard comments from Theresa Quiroz, David Flores of Casa Familiar (written statement submitted for the record), Lisa Cuestas of Casa Familiar (written statement submitted for the record), Dolores von Mirbach of Tradition One, and Jim Varnadore.
- Several Members of the Board responded to comments and issues brought up in public comment.

### **Information/Discussion Items**

- Board Chair Audie de Castro reconvened The Consolidated Plan Advisory Board meeting from the September 8, 2011 meeting to continue discussion of the FY 2013 CDBG Application Scoring Criteria.
- Discussion of allocation of points for scoring criteria items 2, 3, 4 and 5 was resumed. Board Member Will Moore proposed to take 5 points from Item 4 and add to criterion 2, for a revised point-allocation of: 1 = 15, 2 = 20, 3 = 20, 4 = 20, 5 = 15, and 6 = 10. Board Member Jennifer Litwak expressed concern that the change would put criterion 2 higher than criterion 1, giving more prioritization to Project Benefit to Low and Moderate Income over Relationship to Consolidated Plan Goals. Ms. Litwak stated that these two criteria should “co-exist” and preferred the point-allocation stay as is. Board Member Mathew Kostrinsky inquired of CDBG staff whether this change would continue to meet HUD’s requirement that the City meet the Consolidated Plan’s goals. Beth Murray informed the Board that HUD has not yet weighed in on the proposed new scoring criteria, but that HUD’s main concern was that the Plan’s goals be met. Board Member Vicki Granowitz agreed with the proposed point-allocation change. Ms. Granowitz also reminded the Board that during a previous discussion, it was anticipated that because this scoring criteria was a new system, there would likely be

changes in the future. Both Mr. de Castro and Board Member Robert McNamara agreed with the revised point-allocation.

- Jim Varnadore offered a typographical recommendation to Criterion 3(c) – “refer to San Diego as a city, eighth largest in the United States, comprised of almost five dozen communities, some of which have neighborhoods, and not continue this fiction that San Diego is a community.” Mr. Moore pointed out the legal issues with using the descriptive term “City of San Diego.” Mr. Varnadore disagreed. Vicki Granowitz suggested the change to “San Diego communities” in that she understood what Mr. Varnadore was saying. Mr. de Castro requested a motion.
- A member of the public questioned if the “weighting of the criteria as far as the points were concerned” would favor a larger national organization versus a smaller local organization. Mr. de Castro, Mr. Kostrinsky, and Ms. Granowitz responded that the intent is not to focus on the size of an organization but to look at the program itself and that which could best serve a higher percentage of the communities more effectively. It was pointed out that some modifications to the criteria actually benefitted smaller organizations by giving less weight to factors that would normally favor larger organizations. Mr. Moore also clarified that the point system was not-all-or-nothing but weighed contextually.
- In reviewing the changes to the criteria made at the last Board meeting, Mr. de Castro revisited the discussion of criterion 5(e) and the stricken phrase “...the Board of Directors consists of diverse community representation...” Mr. de Castro now favored factoring in the need for the Board to “have some level of diversity” to its makeup. Ms. Litwak stated that she was not comfortable with defining/judging the term of “diverse community representation” (i.e. ethnically, regionally, economic, professional diversity) and was not comfortable with dictating a board’s development, nor did she feel there was any way to effectively measure the criteria. Mr. de Castro was also in agreement that it is not the role of the Advisory Board to dictate the diversity of any board, but recognized that the board should be diverse enough to serve/represent its target population effectively. Mr. Moore suggested reinstating the stricken phrase because it offered a “sense of

connection with the community.” Mr. Kostrinsky’s concerns revolved around a board that was not engaged regardless of its diversity.

- Mr. Kostrinsky left the meeting at 10:55 a.m. A quorum was still established.
- Mr. McNamara raised an issue with Criterion 4 – regarding subsections for CIP projects and Direct Services. Since not all criteria will be necessarily applicable to the individual application Mr. McNamara suggested the additional phrase “as applicable” and the revised lines should read “For CIP Projects, the factors will consist of the following *as applicable*” and “For Direct Services Projects, the factors will consist of the following *as applicable*.” This change was accepted by all Board Members.
- Mr. Flores and Ms. Cuestas from Casa Familiar thanked the Board and the staff for putting the discussion forward, feeling it was invaluable, and left written comments for the record.
- Mr. de Castro asked staff what the next steps were. Ms. Murray advised the Board the next immediate step was to present the final Board approved “FY 2013 CDBG Application Scoring Criteria” to the Public Safety & Neighborhood Services Committee [*This has been docketed for October 12, 2011*]. And that at the next Advisory Board meeting, the Board should discuss its presentation to committee. Future discussion items should include input on the actual FY2013 CDBG applications; Consolidated Plan goals; and, per Ms. Litwak’s inquiry, presentations on HOME, ESG, and HOPWA.

#### **Action Item**

- Vicki Granowitz made the motion to 1) approve the Fiscal Year 2013 point-allocation to include Category 1 Relationship to Consolidated Plan Goals a maximum point of 15, Number 2 Project Benefit to Low and Moderate Income to be 20 points, Number 3 Project Outcomes/Effectiveness to be 20 points, Number 4 Project Activities/Timeliness to be 20 points, Number 5 Organizational Capacity/Capability/Track Record to be 15 points, Number 6 Budget Justification and Leverage of Funds to be 10 points for a total of a maximum 100-point scoring; and 2) that the scoring criteria come back to the Board for re-evaluation for Fiscal Year 2014. Robert McNamara

seconded. The motion passed 6-0 (Aye – de Castro, Granowitz, Kostrinsky, Litwak, McNamara, Moore; Absent – Freeburg)

- Will Moore made the motion to re-introduce the stricken phrase “the Board of Directors consists of diverse community representation” and instead of “consists of” replace with the word “include” – “the Board of Directors *includes* diverse community representation.” Vicki Granowitz seconded. The motion passed 4-1 (Aye – de Castro, Granowitz, McNamara, Moore; Nay – Litwak; Absent – Freeburg, Kostrinsky).
- Will Moore made the motion to adopt the “FY2013 CDBG Application Scoring Criteria” with the four additional changes discussed today. Robert McNamara seconded. The motion passed 5-0 (Aye – de Castro, Granowitz, Litwak, McNamara, Moore; Absent – Freeburg, Kostrinsky.)
- Mr. de Castro recommended the Advisory Board meet the 1<sup>st</sup> Thursday of every month at 9:00 a.m. for one hour.

### **Adjournment**

- Robert McNamara moved to adjourn. Vicki Granowitz seconded. The motion passed 5-0 (Aye – de Castro, Granowitz, Litwak, McNamara, Moore; Absent – Freeburg, Kostrinsky.). The meeting was adjourned at 11:05 a.m.